

Scoring Rubric for 2004-2006 Title II, Part B(1) Mathematics Science Partnership Competitive Grant

Demonstration of Need		30 Points	
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>lacks a description of local needs as they relate to students' mathematics or science performance; and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>vaguely describes the local needs as they relate to students' mathematics or science performance; and</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>clearly describes the local needs as they relate to students' mathematics or science performance; and</p> <p>(6 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>clearly describes the local needs as they relate to students' mathematics or science performance; and</p> <p>(10 points)</p>
<p>does not provide ample data related to student achievement to convince the program is needed; and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>includes some data related to student achievement in the district; and</p> <p>(2 points)</p>	<p>includes valid data related to student achievement in mathematics or science for the district served by the program; and</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>includes multiple types and multiple years of detailed data related to student achievement in mathematics or science for the specific target population served by the program; and how eligibility data justifies need; and</p> <p>(5 points)</p>
<p>does not address the AYP or Education YES! status of the target school(s); and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>includes some data related to AYP or Education YES!, but not both.</p> <p>(2 points)</p>	<p>indicates without evidence that the school(s) falls within the required AYP and Education YES! status; and</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>provides proof of the school(s)' status related to AYP and Education YES!; and</p> <p>(5 points)</p>
<p>does not address prior efforts to improve teacher knowledge and student achievement in mathematics or science.</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>vaguely refers to prior professional development in mathematics or science in the target school(s).</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>lists prior efforts to improve teacher content knowledge and student achievement.</p> <p>(6 points)</p>	<p>provides detailed description of prior efforts to improve teacher content knowledge and student achievement in mathematics or science and how this program will relate to and build on those efforts and how various on-going grants will coordinate with each other.</p> <p>(10 points)</p>

If need is not adequately presented and documented then the proposal will not be funded!

Evaluation Plan

40 Points

Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>The Proposal: does not address an arrangement with an outside evaluator or does not do so convincingly; and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal: indicates that the applicant will contract with an independent evaluator; and</p> <p>(7 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal: provides evidence that the applicant will contract with an independent evaluator; and</p> <p>(10 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal: provides evidence that the applicant will contract with an independent evaluator to design, collect, and analyze data about the program model, curriculum and impact on both teacher and student learning in mathematics or science; and</p> <p>(15 points)</p>
<p>does not address a plan for an evaluation or plan that is offered has not established control or comparison groups*.</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>indicates there will be an evaluation with measurable objectives. The evaluation has defined treatment and control (comparison groups) with adequate sample sizes in each group*.</p> <p>(10 points)</p>	<p>describes detailed plans for an evaluation with measurable objectives and annual targets that describes progress toward meeting the goals and objectives of the program. The evaluation has defined treatment and control (comparison groups) with adequate sample sizes in each group*.</p> <p>(15 points)</p>	<p>describes detailed plans for an evaluation with measurable objectives and annual targets which describe both progress toward meeting the goals and objectives indicated by the established need of student learning of mathematics or science and teachers' mathematics or science content knowledge and student performance on mathematics or science assessments. The evaluation has defined treatment and control (comparison groups) with adequate sample sizes in each group*.</p> <p>(25 points) If less than 10 points, the grant proposal will be rejected.</p>

If you are encountering difficulty with control/comparisons groups contact Rodger Epp (eppr@michigan.gov) for assistance.

Research or Evidence Base		20 Points	
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>does not address the current state of knowledge relevant to the program; and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>refers to the current state of knowledge about the program; and</p> <p>(2 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>includes a brief or sketchy review of the current state of knowledge about mathematics or science and/or professional development in mathematics or science; and</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>includes a comprehensive review of the state of knowledge relevant to the program; and</p> <p>(5 points)</p>
<p>makes no connection between proposed professional development and scientifically based research; and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>includes a weak connection between the proposed professional development and scientifically-based research or to research that is not scientifically-based; and</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>includes an unsubstantiated reference to scientifically-based research (or, at a minimum, theory research) about the proposed professional development; and</p> <p>(6 points)</p>	<p>includes a description of the scientifically-based research (or, at a minimum, theory research) which influenced the proposed response to the identified need(s) and includes the source of the research.</p> <p>(10 points)</p>
<p>has no description of prior professional development in mathematics or science.</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>includes a vague description of prior professional development in mathematics or science.</p> <p>(2 points)</p>	<p>includes a vague description of prior professional development in mathematics or science and what was learned from it.</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>includes a detailed description of prior work in mathematics or science professional development, its impact, lessons learned from it and how those lessons are incorporated into this program.</p> <p>(5 points)</p>

Plan of Work		60 Points	
Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>fails to include the goals and objectives of the program; and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>includes a brief list of the goals and objectives of the program; and</p> <p>(5 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>describes without detail the goals and objectives of the program; and</p> <p>(10 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>clearly describes in detail the goals and objectives of the program; and</p> <p>(15 points)</p>
<p>does not describe the partners or what their responsibilities are; and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>describes the partners; and</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>clearly describes the roles and responsibilities of each partner; and shows evidence of relationship with STEM faculty in all aspects of grant; and</p> <p>(6 points)</p>	<p>clearly describes in detail the roles and responsibilities of each partner including the percentage and amount of time contributed by each partners; and shows evidence of strong relationship with STEM faculty in all aspects of grant; and</p> <p>(10 points)</p>
<p>does not include sufficient information about the proposed professional development activities; and does not address school improvement goals or does not show any connection between the school improvement goals of the target school(s); and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>includes a list of the professional development activities; and incomplete and/or unclear implementation plan that addresses some of the required components; Includes a list of the school improvement goals and indicates how this program fits those goals; and</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>includes a clear description of the professional development activities including the types and duration; and includes a list of the corresponding school improvement goals of each participating school and shows an alignment; and</p> <p>(6 points)</p>	<p>includes a clear and detailed description of the professional development activities including the number, types, duration and intensity; and includes a list of the corresponding school improvement goals of each participating school and clearly lists how this professional development program is integrated into that goal; and</p> <p>(10 points)</p>
<p>does not address the targeted Michigan mathematics or science benchmarks; and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>includes a description of which Michigan mathematics or science benchmarks align with the proposed program; and</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>includes a description of how the proposed professional development content will incorporate the targeted Michigan mathematics or science benchmarks; and</p> <p>(4 points)</p>	<p>includes a clear and detailed description of how the proposed professional development content will incorporate the targeted Michigan mathematics or science benchmarks; and</p> <p>(5 points)</p>
<p>does not provide sufficient evidence that the proposed professional development is aligned with Michigan's professional development standards (NSDC Staff Development Standards 2001); and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>indicates that the proposed professional development is aligned with Michigan's professional development standards (NSDC Staff Development Standards 2001); and</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>describes how the proposed professional development is aligned with Michigan's professional development standards (NSDC Staff Development Standards 2001) including work-embedded application of new learning, continuous reflection and ongoing support; and</p> <p>(6 points)</p>	<p>describes a plan that illustrates convincingly how the proposed professional development is aligned with Michigan's professional development standards (NSDC Staff Development Standards 2001) including a design that provides for work-embedded application of new learning, continuous reflection and ongoing support; and</p> <p>(10 points)</p>

Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>does not describe how the activities will help the MSP Program build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, and usable body of findings; and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>vaguely describes how the activities will help the MSP Program build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, and usable body of findings; and</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>describes how the activities will help the MSP Program build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, and usable body of findings; and</p> <p>(4 points)</p>	<p>clearly articulates how the activities will help the MSP Program build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, and usable body of findings; and what is proposed to be in professional development materials; and</p> <p>(5 points)</p>
<p>does not include a timeline.</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>includes a vague or impractical timeline.</p> <p>(1 point)</p>	<p>includes a timeline that shows when activities will occur and the partner responsible for each activity.</p> <p>(2 points)</p>	<p>includes a detailed timeline that shows when specific activities will occur and the partner responsible for each activity.</p> <p>(5 points)</p>

Management Capability**20 Points**

Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>either does not address the capability of the submitting team or does not do so convincingly; and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>indicates that the submitting team has the capacity to implement the program; and</p> <p>(2 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>indicates that the submitting team has the capability of managing the project including organization of the work and accommodating the deadlines; and</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>demonstrates with specifics that the submitting team has the capability of managing the project including organization of the work and accommodating the deadlines; and</p> <p>(5 points)</p>
<p>does not address this criteria;and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>indicates that the partners will share the work.</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>includes a brief description of how the partners will share the work.</p> <p>(6 points)</p>	<p>includes a brief description of how the partners will share the work and how their work will be integrated into the on-going work of the school; and</p> <p>(10 points)</p>
<p>does not demonstrate the content and training expertise of the staff providing the content training.</p> <p>(0 points)</p>			<p>demonstrate the content and training expertise of the staff providing the content training.</p> <p>(5 points)</p>

Sustainability**20 Points**

Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>either does not address this criteria or does not convince that the results can be sustained beyond the life of this program.</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>indicates that the results can be sustained beyond the life of this program.</p> <p>(6 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>provides evidence and a description how the results can be sustained beyond the life of this program.</p> <p>(12 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal:</p> <p>provides evidence and a description how the results can be sustained beyond the life of this program by providing an opportunity for continued professional learning and ongoing assessment of impact on student learning.</p> <p>(20 points)</p>

Budget Summary and Detail**10 Points**

Poor, Incomplete, not Comprehensive	Marginally Comprehensive, Lacks Rigor	Comprehensive, Rigorous	Exceptionally Comprehensive and Rigorous
<p>The Proposal: does not include a budget detail and/or summary; and does not provide a budget detail and summary for a 24-month project; and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal: provides insufficient budget detail to know with certainty that the budget will support the program; and does not provide a budget detail and summary for a 24-month project; and</p> <p>(2 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal: provides budget detail to show reasonable expenses for each required category; and provides a budget detail and summary for a 24-month project; and</p> <p>(3 points)</p>	<p>The Proposal: provides sufficient budget detail to show it supports the scope and requirements of the program; and provides a budget detail and summary for a 24-month project; and</p> <p>(5 points)</p>
<p>does not include provisions for an independent evaluator, funds for key staff to participate in at least two state technical assistance meetings; and</p> <p>(0 points)</p>			<p>includes provisions for an independent evaluator, funds for key staff to participate in at least 3-4 state technical assistance meetings and an annual national meeting; and includes a description of all match or in-kind contributions of the partners; and</p> <p>(2 points)</p>
<p>does not adhere to allowable costs.</p> <p>(0 points)</p>			<p>adheres to allowable costs.</p> <p>(3 points)</p>

Mathematics and Science Center Involvement**30 Incentive points**

Although not a federally mandated requirement for the grant, Michigan will award incentive points to proposals that describe active involvement of the Mathematics/Science Center(s) throughout the project. Up to 30 extra points can be added at the discretion of the reviewers based on the quality and extent of the participation of the Mathematics/Science Center(s).